DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 942 EC 132 419

TITLE	Project Sunrise: Handicapped Children's Early Education Program: Third Year Demonstration. Final Report, July 1, 1979-June 30, 1980.
INSTITUTION	Eastern Montana Coll., Billings. Inst. for Rehabilitative Service.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	444AH70256
PUB DATE	Jun 80
GRANT	G007700884
NOTE	75p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; *Early Childhood Education; Handicap Identification; Home Programs; *Program Evaluation; *Rural Areas; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	Montana; Project Sunrise

ABSTRACT

Final year achievements of a 3 year federally funded early education program for handicapped children in rural Montana are recounted. Noted are personnel aspects of the project, staff development activities and responses, objectives of technical assistance, child find data, and dissemination and demonstration activities. A section on program evaluation reviews problems encountered in the evaluation process. Results of intervention are reported for 20 children, including that 95% of them demonstrated gains over the anticipated rate of growth in at least four developmental areas. Eleven major project objectives are listed in terms of procedure, outcome, and evaluation. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EC 11/22

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN'S EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

ED199942

THIRD YEAR DEMONSTRATION

FINAL REPORT

July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kay L. Baker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC132419

Grant No: G007700884
Project No: 444AH70256
Project Title: Project Sunrise
Project Location: Billings, Mt. 59101
Lewistown, Mt. 59457

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Program Performance Report 1

Narrative 5

Objectives 29

APPENDIX A

Workshop Evaluation
Needs Assessment
Montana Symposium Evaluation
Montana Symposium Brochure

APPENDIX B

Referral Table
Child Progress Data
Parent Satisfaction Evaluation
Home Visitor Evaluation

OCT 2 0 1980

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 51-R1091

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORT (Discretionary Grants)

Further monies or other benefits may be, but will not necessarily be, withheld under this program unless this report is completed and filed as required by existing law and regulations *(45 CFR 121, GSA FMC 74-7)*.

Part I

All grantees with awards from programs listed under "General Instructions" above respond.

1. Date of Report:	2. Grant Number:
August 6, 1980	G00770084
3. Period of Report: From: 7/1/79	**To:** 6/30/80

4. Grantee Name and Descriptive Name of Project:

Preschool Services for the Handicapped: Project Sunrise

Certification: I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report *(consisting of this and subsequent pages and attachments)* is correct and complete in all respects, except as may be specifically noted herein.

Typed Name of Project Director(s) or Principal Investigator(s):	Signature of Project Director(s) or Principal Investigator(s):
Ronald P. Sexton, Ph.D.	

Part II *("Accomplishment" Reporting)*

A. All grantees, except for those with awards under 13.443 are to respond to this Section A. Grantees under 13.443 go to B of Part II.

All grantees with awards under 13.444 except those supported solely for "Outreach" activities are to follow the organization of categories listed below in presenting their performance reports. The categories are based on activities common to all Early Childhood projects with the exception noted above for projects solely supported for outreach activities.

(1) Direct and Supplementary Services for Children's Services
(2) Parent/Family Participation
(3) Assessment of Child's Progress
(4) Inservice Training for Project Staff
(5) Training for Personnel from other Programs or Agencies
(6) Demonstration and Dissemination Activities
(7) Coordination with other Agencies
(8) Continuation and Replication

The grant application for programs 13.445, 13.446, 13.450, and 13.520 provided for the following functions or activities as categorical headings in the budget and narrative sections:

Research and Development	Dissemination
Demonstration/Service	Preservice/Inservice
Evaluation	Training

Programs 13.451, and 13.452 do not usually require a breakout since the primary function or activity is intrinsic to the respective program.

For each of the above programs, functions, or activities *(as well as those of special import for certain programs; e.g., replication, advisory councils, parent involvement)* discuss the objectives and subobjectives presented in the approved application *(in narrative format)* in terms of:

(a) Accomplishments and milestones met.
(b) Slippages in attainment and reasons for the slippages.

Refer back to your application and utilize your quantitative quarterly projections, scheduled chronological order and target dates, and data collected and maintained as well as criteria and methodologies used to evaluate results for (a) and (b). For grantees under 13.444, in discussing training or personnel from other programs, include descriptions of types of training, institutions or organizations involved, and numbers of trainees and hours of training received.

Also highlight those phases of the plans of action presented in your application that proved most successful, as well as those that upon implementation did not appear fruitful. NOTE: Outreach grantees are to discuss accomplishments and slippages in terms of replication and stimulation of services, resources provided and field testing and dissemination and training in terms of types of personnel receiving training and the number of hours involved.

Grantees finishing this portion of Part II, go to C of Part II.

B. Reporting for Grantees under 13.443 *(Research and Demonstration)*.

Discuss major activities carried out, major departures from the original plan, problems encountered, significant preliminary findings, results, and a description and evaluation of any final product. Either include copies of, or discuss: information materials released; reports in newspapers, maga-

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE (Nonconstruction Programs)

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. APPLICANT NAME (from Item 4 on SF 424)	2. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF PROJECT (from Item 7 on SF 424)
Preschool Services for the Handicapped	Project Sunrise

INSTRUCTIONS

Programs may involve Demonstration/Service activities and/or Preservice or Inservice Training activities. Any applicant whose project calls for such activities must fill out the relevant portions of the tables below. Data presented should be for the year of funding requested and will be used as one base measure to determine accomplishment for Demonstration/Service and/or Preservice or Inservice Training activities (see Part IV, Item 3b in the Instructions for the application).

In Table 1 enter the projected performance data for the first budget period into the appropriate boxes. Use age as of the start of the grant project. Data for lines 1 through 11 are for those enrolled or receiving major services and not merely screened, referred, or given minimal or occasional services.

Table 2: Preservice/Inservice Training Activities. Persons can receive training in two or more areas of concentration. While it is acceptable to have duplicate counts of trainees across areas of concentration (rows 1-12), the TOTAL (row 13) should represent an unduplicated count of persons to receive training.

TABLE 1
PART A - DEMONSTRATION/SERVICE ACTIVITIES

	TYPE OF HANDICAP	NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED PERSONS TO BE SERVED BY AGE			
		AGES 0-2	AGES 3-5	AGES 6-8	AGES 9-21
1.	MENTALLY RETARDED	3	4	2	
2.	HARD OF HEARING	1			
3.	DEAF				
4.	SPEECH IMPAIRED	5	16	1	
5.	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED		1		
6.	SERIOUSLY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	1	1	2	
7.	ORTHOPEDICALLY IMPAIRED	1			
8.	OTHER HEALTH IMPAIRED	1			
9.	SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES		3	3	
10.	DEAF-BLIND		1		
11.	MULTIHANDICAPPED		1		
12.	TOTAL	12	27	8	

TABLE I
PART B – PROJECT STAFF TO PROVIDE SERVICES TO RECIPIENTS IN TABLE IA

TYPE OF STAFF	NUMBER	
	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME * (As full-time equivalents)
PROFESSIONNEL PERSONNEL (excluding teachers)	3	
TEACHERS **		
PARAPROFESSIONAL		1.5 F.T.E.. 6 people at .25

TABLE I
Part C – ANCILLARY SERVICES TO PERSONS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS
(Including Recepients in Table IA)

SERVICE	NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED
SCREENED Total 856	65*
DIAGNOSTIC AND EVALUATIVE	4*
OTHER RESOURCE ASSISTANCE (specify) Screenings indirect services	895

*Amount of time for less than full-time work divided by time normally required in a corresponding full-time activity.

**Staff members who instruct pupils.

*referred to specific disciplines for evaluation
*referred for comprehensive evaluation

TABLE 2 - PRESERVICE/INSERVICE TRAINING ACTIVITIES

	AREA OF CONCENTRATION	NUMBER OF STUDENTS TO RECEIVE PRESERVICE TRAINING BY DEGREE PROGRAM*				NUMBER OF PERSONS TO RECEIVE INSERVICE TRAINING	
		A.A.	B.A.	M.A.	POST-MASTERS	REGULAR EDUCATORS	SPECIAL EDUCATORS
1.	ADMINISTRATION						
2.	EARLY CHILDHOOD/ special education	7	39	50		104	174
3.	MENTALLY RETARDED						
4.	SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES						
5.	DEAF-BLIND						
6.	DEAF / HARD-OF-HEARING						
7.	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED						
8.	SERIOUSLY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED						
9.	SPEECH IMPAIRED						
10.	ORTHOPEDICALLY IMPAIRED						
11.	OTHER HEALTH IMPAIRED						
12.	MULTIHANDICAPPED						
13.	TOTAL (Unduplicated Count)	7	39	50		104	174

*Formalized arrangements with institutuions of higher education or faculty.

OE Form 9037, 3/79

Table IIIA
Placement of Children Participating in Early Childhood Program During Reporting Period

Indicate the placement of children who left your project during the year covered by this report period.
NOTE: Count each child only once by primary type of placement below.

TYPE OF PLACEMENT			NUMBER OF CHILDREN	
			FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
INTEGRATED PLACEMENT *(i.e., in regular programs with children who are NOT handicapped)*	Nursery schools			1
	Day-care programs			
	Head Start		1	
	Pre-kindergarten		1	
	Kindergarten		1	
	Primary grades	First	1	1
		Second		
		Other		
SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT *(i.e., in classes only for handicapped children but situated in regular private or public school)*	Pre-kindergarten		3	2
	Kindergarten			
	Primary grades	First		1
		Second		
		Other		
INSTITUTIONAL PLACEMENT	Scheduled to remain in Early Childhood Program in coming year			
	Other *(specify)* School for Deaf & Blind		1	

Table IIIB

Cumulative number of children entered into integrated placement *(if known)* prior to this report period →	NUMBER	Estimated retention rate of cumulative number in integrated placement →	PERCENT
	7		100%

NARRATIVE

Staff Maintenance

The Early Childhood Special Education Specialist in the Lewistown, Montana office resigned as a full time staff member effective July 1, 1979. To insure a smooth transition within that office, the specialist continued on a part time basis until September 1, 1979. The full time position of Early Childhood Special Education Specialist was advertised nationally. This position was filled August 27, 1979. Regretably, the position once again became vacant when the newly hired specialist resigned as of December 15, 1979 to accept another position in the eastern part of the state with a significant salary increase. On January 14, 1980 the position was once again filled.

The Early Childhood Special Education Specialist in the Billings office resigned effective April 1, 1980. Due to the tenuous circumstances surrounding continuation funding, the decision was made not to fill the position for the remaining three months of project duration.

Application for the position of graduate assistant to the project were reviewed. The position was filled September 24, 1979.

The secretary for the Lewistown office, a .50 FTE position, resigned effective July 30, 1979. The decision was made to fill this position following the hiring on an Early Childhood Special Education Specialist in August. The secretarial position was filled in October.

On September 10, 1979 the position of home visitor for Stillwater County became vacant. The vacancy was announced throughout the county. This position was filled October 15, 1979.

Staff Development

Weekly conferences were scheduled between the project director and coordinator to monitor and review project activity. During the week of December 2-7, 1979, the director and coordinator participated in HCEEP Project Directors Conference in Washington, D.C. The Conference provided an excellent opportunity to meet with other professionals in the field. The following table summarizes staff evaluation of the conference.

Conference Evaluation

Project Directors Conference

December 2-7, 1979

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree
NA - Not Applicable

SA	A	D	SD	NA	
50%	50%				1. Participation in this activity was of benefit to me.
	100%				2. Stated goals and objectives were accomplished.
	100%				3. Enough time was allotted for this activity.
50%	50%				4. This activity will help me to more competently function in my position.
				X	5. Participation in this activity will enhance my opportunity for career advancement.

Monthly staff meetings were scheduled between the two demonstration sites to provide continuity of program services. Weekly telephone contact was maintained in an effort to maximize the professional support system between the two sites. In addition, inservice activities to promote professional growth were maintained.

On July 24, 1979, The Early Childhood Special Education Specialists participated in a four hour workshop designed to increase supervisory skills. This inservice was conducted on site in Billings. On August 21, 1979, a four hour follow-up inservice designed to increase the Early Childhood Special Education Specialists skill in conducting productive meetings was held on site in Billings. Evaluations by participating staff rated the two inservice workshops as highly beneficial as indicated by the following summary of the two workshops.

Workshop Evaluation

of

Increasing Supervisory Skills - July 24, 1979
Conducting Productive Meetings - August 21, 1979

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
D - Disgaree
SD - Strongly Disagree
NA - Not Applicable

SA	A	D	SD	NA	
100%					1. Participation in this activity was of benefit to me.
17%	83%				2. Stated goals and objectives were accomplished
34%	66%				3. Enough time was allotted for this activity.
100%					4. This activity will help me to more competently function in my position.
83%	17%				5. Participation in this activity will enhance my opportunity for career advancement.

During the week of April 21-25, 1980 the project director and coordinator attended National CEC in Philadelphia. Attendance at the Conference was rated as very worthwhile, as indicated by the following evaluation.

Conference Evaluation

National CEC

April 21-25, 1980

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree
NA - Not Applicable

SA	A	D	SD	NA	
50%	50%				1. Participation in this activity was of benefit to me.
50%	50%				2. Stated goals and objectives were accomplished.
50%	50%				3. Enough time was allotted for this activity.
	100%				4. This activity will help me to more competently function in my position.
	50% 50%			50%	5. Participation in this activity will enhance my opportunity for career advancement.

Through informal assessment, staff identified proposal writing skills as high priority. Sunrise applied for and was awarded a scholarship for one staff member to participate in the Grantsmanship Workshop offered on the campus of Eastern Montana College, January 21-26, 1980. During the week of June 2-6, 1980, the coordinator participated in the Grantsmanship Workshop, again offered on campus at Eastern Montana College.

Grantsmanship Workshop Evaluation

SA	A	D	SD	NA	
100%					1. Participation in this activity was of benefit to me.
50%	50%				2. Stated goals and objectives were accomplished.
100%					3. Enough time was allotted for this activity.
100%					4. This activity will help me to more competently function in my position.
100%					5. Participation in this activity will enhance my opportunities for career advancement.

Home visitor staff development was maintained through weekly contact with the supervisor. During demonstration Year III four of the five home visitors reached criteria on 100% of forty-two identified competencies. The fifth home visitor, hired as of October, 1979 achieved 62% of the forty-two identified competencies as of April 1, 1980.

Home visitors were invited to participate in the Montana Symposium on Early Education and The Exceptional Child, sponsored by Project Sunrise and the School of Extended Studies, a division of Eastern Montana College, held February 29, 1980 - March 1, 1980. One undergraduate or one graduate credit hour was offered. Although home visitors registering for credit were required to pay the credit fee, the registration fee was waived. Four of the five home visitors attended the Symposium. Two of the four home visitors registered for credit.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance to the project was delivered through Western States Technical Assistance Resource (WESTAR). The project staff identified continuation funding as a major objective on the WESTAR agreement. On December 18, 1979 Arthur J. Moreau, President, Continuing Education Programs of America, Inc. provided on site consultation to project staff on continuation funding.

The second objective on the Western States Technical Assistance Agreement addressed 1) securing funding for rural progrms, 2) rural child find and 3) recruiting staff for rural area programs. In meeting the objective, WESTAR paid travel and per diem for one project staff member to attend the rural workshop on March 12-15 In Nashville, Tennessee. Evaluation of the technical assistance activities are depicted on the following charts:

Evaluation of Technical Assistance

Continuation Funding

December 18, 1979

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree
NA - Not Applicable

SA	A	NA	D	SD	
100%					1. Participation in this activity was of benefit to me.
100%					2. Stated goals and objectives were accomplished.
34%	66%				3. Enough time was allotted for this activity.
66%	34%				4. This activity will help me to more competently function in my position.
66%	18%	16%			5. Participation in this activity will enhance my opportunities for career advancement.

Workshop Evaluation

Rural Topical

Nashville, Tennessee

March 13-15, 1980

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree
NA - Not Applicable

SA	A	NA	D	SD	
	X				1. Participation in this activity was of benefit to me.
X					2. Stated goals and objectives were accomplished.
	X				3. Enough time was allotted for this activity.
	X				4. This activity will help me to more competently function in my position.
	X				5. Participation in this activity will enhance my opportunities for career advancement.

Advisory Council

Advisory Council meetings are held three times per year, alternating between Billings and Lewistown, Montana. The first advisory council meeting for Demonstration Year III was held on September 11, 1979 in Billings. Scott Lane, Coordinator, Early Education Programs for the Handicapped for the State of Montana, presented. In addition to council members, the audience included administrators and interested Eastern Montana College faculty and students. The January 8, 1980 advisory council meeting was scheduled in Lewistown. Advisory Council attendance was 60% in spite of inclement weather. On May 13, 1980 the final Advisory Council meeting, was held in Billings.

Child Progress

A pre and post administration of the Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile was one means of assessing child progress. This instrument provided a data base for 36% of the program children. Project staff expressed dissatisfaction with the instrument because developmental tasks were not discreet enough to lend themselves to adequate educational program planning.

The Uniform Performanace Assessment Scale (UPAS) and the Curriculum Assessment Monitoring System (CAMS) proved to be very functional and criterion referenced measures of child progress. Appropriate components of these two instruments were administered quarterly resulting in the monitoring of ninety educational programs for the forty-seven children who received direct services throughout the project year.

Field Testing and Model Revision

Regularly scheduled home visits were maintained through March, 1980. Referrals were not accepted after January 1, 1980 and home visitors began to phase out their assigned families during March and April. Forty-seven children representing more than fifty families received direct services during the project year.

An average of twenty-six families per month (July '79 - April '80) were engaged in parent training activities. A parent/child lending library was maintained on site in Billings and Lewistown. Educational toys designed to assist in meeting child program objectives and relevant parent reading materials were available on a loan basis.

A random sampling of project parents were asked to respond to a five question interview by telephone. Results of that interview are summarized on the following chart:

Parent Satisfaction Interview Results

1. Do you feel the Project Sunrise program has helped

(a)	your child?	Yes 9	No 0	Some 1
(b)	you as parents?	Yes 7	No 0	Some 3
(c)	your other children?	Yes 7	No 0	Some 3

2. What part of the home visit was most helpful?

(a)	home visitor	5
(b)	toys, parent readings, etc.	3
(c)	equally helpful	2

3. Would you recommend this type service to anyone else?

Yes 10 No 0

4. Do you feel it would be worthwhile to continue such a program? (as Sunrise).

Yes 10 No 0

5. In the event funds are not available to continue such a program (as Sunrise), what do you feel the loss whould be to

(a) your family?

-- regression of child's learning skills
-- lose a "lot"
-- understanding of home visitor
-- materials, books, toys, etc.
-- very definite loss in "many ways"
__ only available source of help in isolated area

(b) your community?

-- non prevention of future problems, including high school age
-- only source of help in isolated areas would be removed
-- lack of help to families who couldn't afford it otherwise

Data gathered during this period of time was analyzed and appropriate modification of the model were implemented. The final manuscript was delivered to the printer on June 1, 1980. A copy of the Project Sunrise Model accompanies this document.

Child Find

Twenty-eight individual children were screened through Project Sunrise. An additional 856 children residing in forty-two school district participated in community screenings. Thirty-four referrals to the project were made as a result of the screenings and sixty-nine children were referred to appropriate disciplines for evaluation.

Child Find activities included the distribution of brochures and pamphlets, media coverage and guest presentations.

Continuation Funding

Project staff explored funding options at the local, state and federal level. A needs assessment was conducted throughout Montana and Northern Wyoming to provide a data base for possible outreach funding. Results of

the needs assesment, indicating support for outreach activities is presented in Appendix A.. In February, 1980 Project Sunrise submitted an application for outreach funding through the Bureau of Education. Official notification of the grant award was received in July, 1980.

The Commission for Community Affairs of the City of Billings was approached as a possible funding source through city revenue sharing. At the time of this writing, the Commission is considering the proposal.

Project Sunrise and the South Central Regional Mental Health Center submitted a proposal to the National Insititute of Mental Health. Official notification regarding the funding decision of the proposal had not been received at the time of this writing.

Dissemination and Demonstration Activities

In an attempt to promote an awareness of the need for early intervention and understanding of local education agency responsibilities to young handicapped children, project staff have been engaged in a variety of activities. In July, project staff conducted an inservice to Teacher Corps interns. The inservice provided an overview of Public Law 94-142 and special education legislation in the State of Montana.

A prospectus was submitted to the screening committee for the Second Annual Regional Conference for Severely/Profoundly Handicapped to be held at the University of Idaho in Pocatello. The presentation was accepted and staff presented a one and one-half hour sectional on August 28 and 29, 1980 in Pocatello.

Project staff coordinated an inservice for the Roundup school district special education staff to be delivered in October, 1979. The inservice was

designed to acquaint the staff with techniques necessary for program implementation for a young health impaired child.

The Billings Preschool Association invited Project Sunrise to present at the October meeting. The audience consisted of twenty-five preschool teachers. Following the presentation, two representatives made an on site visit to the Billings Demonstration Center.

Fourteen Head Start staff representing five sites in Western Montana participated in a workshop designed to train staff in the implementation of the Comprehensive Identification Process (CIP). Host site was St. Ignatius. Additional participating staff represented Ronan, Polson, Pablo and Arlee.

On November 27, 1979 project staff conducted a day long training workshop in the use of the Comprehensive Identification Process (CIP) for the Hardin Public School screening team. Fourteen individuals participated in the training. A six hour workshop utilizing the CIP was conducted on site for the Hamilton Public Schools. A summary of the participant evaluations are depicted in Appendix A.

The project coordinator was asked to chair a committee to identify possible screening instruments for the Billings Public Schools. The Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL) and the Comprehensive Identification Process (CIP) were the two instruments presented to the district. Recommendation of the committee was the CIP be adopted.

On November 20, 1979 a guest presentation was delivered to the Central

Montana Learning Resource Cooperative in Lewistown. The audience included eighteen district superintendents from a six county area. Following the presentation, a committee of superintendents was formed to explore options for adopting the Project Sunrise Model. This committee met on January 8, 1980 and again on January 15, 1980. Scott Lane, State Preschool Coordinator, attended the January 15, 1980 meeting to explore ways in which the state might assist the cooperative in funding home-based programs. Although the state expressed a willingness to assist the cooperative in the funding of a home-based program over a three year period, the proposal was not adopted because of the uncertainty of future funding patterns for preschool special education in the state. Superintendents expressed concern regarding the legal implications of continuation of permissive programs should local funding be inadequate for such programs at a future date.

Project staff developed and conducted SG 453: Preschool Education for the Handicapped through the Institute for Habilitative Services of Eastern Montana College Summer quarter, 1979 and Winter and Summer quarter 1980 and was offered for three graduate or undergraduate credit hours. The development of SG 453 provided staff an excellent opportunity to impact professionals in the field of early childhood and early childhood special education.

Project Sunrise submitted a presentation prospectus to the screening committee for the Montana State Council for Exceptional Children convention scheduled for March 28 and 29, 1980. The presentation was accepted. Project Sunrise presented a one and one half hour session during the conference. Participant evaluation of the session is presented in Appendix A.

Project staff, in cooperation with the School of Extended Studies and Community Services of Eastern Montana College sponsored the Montana Symposium on Early Education and the Exceptional Child on February 29 and March 1, 1980. The one and one-half day symposium was offered for one undergraduate credit hour and one graduate credit hour. Keynote speakers included Dr. Bud Fredericks of Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon, Dr. Diane Bricker of the University of Oregon at Eugene and Arthur J. Moreau, President, Continuing Education Programs of America, Inc. of Peoria, Illinois. Additional guest speakers included Georgia Ruth Rice, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Shirley Miller, State Director of Special Education.

A panel from the Montana State Department addressed The Roles and Responsibilities of State Agencies to Young Handicapped Children and Their Families. Panel members included 1) Bailey Molineaux, Ph.D., Mental Health and Residential Services Division, Department of Institutions 2) Peggy Fields, Administrator, Developmental Disabilities Division, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, 3) Charles McCarthy, Bureau Chief, Child and Youth Development Bureau, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, 4) Shirley Miller, State Director of Special Education, Office of Public Instruction 5) Sidney Pratt, M.D. , Bureau Chief, Maternal and Child Health Bureau, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services.

A total of 132 individuals registered for the sympsium. Of this total, 31 participants were undergraduates, 41 were graduate students and 60 registered for non-credit. The Symposium brochure and evaluation summary may be found in Appendix A.

Additional guest presentations were conducted for the Eagle Program of the Montana Center for Handicapped Children, The South Central Administrators Association, the Central Montana Learning Resource Cooperative, Kwanis, Denton Public Schools, Special Education aide interns and Teacher Corps of Eastern Montana College.

Project Evaluation

Answers to a number of questions were sought in evaluating the effectiveness of the model. These questions included:

1) How much do children progress developmentally when they are served by the model?

2) Are parents satisfied with educational services provided through the Project Sunrise Model?

3) Can paraprofessional home visitors be trained to effectively implement the model?

4) Is the model cost effective in delivering services to young children in rural areas?

Appropriate evaluation components were developed to provide answers to each of these questions.

Child progress data was collected by three basic techniques. First, the Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile was administered by the early childhood special education specialists who interviewed the parents prior to and periodically during intervention. Second, the home visitors administered selected portions of the CAMS/UPAS assessment prior to program entry and quarterly readministered those portions in which there has been intervention. Third, the home visitors colleced pre- and post intervention data on weekly lesson activities taught by the parents. In addition, some parents also collected daily data on child performance.

Parent satisfaction was measured by annually asking parents to complete and return the Parent Satisfaction Report. Parents were also periodically contacted by the early childhood special education specialists and informal feedback was encouraged regarding program satisfaction.

Since Montana presently has no state certification requirements for people serving in the capacity of home visitors, a basic issue was whether paraprofessionals could be trained to provide educational services to

handicapped young children and their families. It was necessary, therefore, to evaluate this component, in part, through child progress and parent satisfaction. In addition, it was necessary to carefully evaluate the effectiveness of the Project Sunrise Home Visitor Training Program. This was accomplished by maintaining careful records of competency attainment and by having the trainee evaluate individual components of the training program. Home visitor performance was evaluated by the supervisor during joint home visits using the Home Visitor Supervisor Report. Cost effectiveness of the service delivery model was evaluated by maintaining careful fiscal records and analyzing program effectiveness relative to costs.

Evaluation Problems Encountered

One major problem encountered in attempting to evaluate the child progress component was the identification of an appropriate evaluation instrument. The instrument needed to encompass children who were birth through seven years of age and it needed to look at several areas of development rather than providing a unilateral intelligence quotient. It needed to be appropriately administered by staff members who had no particular training, which eliminated instruments such as the Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler Intelligence Profile Scale for Infants (WIPSI). The selected instrument needed to be easily transportable and capable of being administered in homes which often have less than ideal administration conditions. Most importantly, the instrument needed to be highly reliable and valid with norming data available on a population similar to the target population of the project.

The selection of the Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile, a parent interview instrument, required compromise on some criteria. This instrument covered the entire age span, examined five developmental areas, could be

administered in the home by minimally trained personnel and was considered quite reliable and valid.

It had not, however, been normed on a rural or Indian population. Another limitation was that the instrument was quite non-specific and is, in fact, described as a screening instrument. Norming data was obtained on a population whose parents had no reason to either exaggerate or under-estimate their children's abilities. As a result, those parents may have been more accurate reporters of their children's skills than were the parents of project children who realized that service provision was, in part, dependent upon their responses.

Research and selection of an appropriate instument took many months. As a result intervention began with several children prior to the first administration of the Developmental Profile. No one instrument was administered to children prior to the selection of the Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile and informal observational data was the primary intervention data kept during the interim.

Other problems were also encountered which affected the number of children upon whom Developmental Profile data was collected. Some families moved away unexpectedly before the second administration of the instrument could be completed. A minimal number of families were unwilling to participate in the interview process necessary in the administration of the instrument.

There are three groups of children upon whom at least some information was collected. The first group is comprised of children who were screened and found to be ineligible for services or who were immediately referred to a more appropriate agency. No progress data was collected for this group. The second group of children received intervention but, for the reasons discussed above, were not administered the Developmental Profile. However, data on

objectives accomplished was collected during intervention. The third group was administered all instruments in accordance with the written model.

Problems were also encountered in collecting data on parent behaviors. Theoretically it was thought that during the assessment process and supervisory home visits, the early childhood special education specialists would be able to take data on parent-child interaction using the Parent Observation Form. This proved to be unsatisfactory since parents were found to be extremely threatened knowing that their behaviors were being closely observed and data was being collected. In many cases parents were not yet accepting the idea that their child was delayed. In some cases services were provided as a result of a court order which required a great deal of tact in order to establish even minimal rapport with the family. Almost no families were originally at a point of adjustment in the grieving process which would have permitted utilization of the Parent Observation Form. As a result, data collection on the parent-child interaction component was abandoned, and the primary data relative to parents which was recorded was that obtained from the Parent Satisfaction Report. In addition the Home Observation for the Measurement of the Environment was administered in those families where the parents were not thought to be unduly threatened by the utilization of such an instrument.

Throughout the data collection process it was necessary to keep in mind that project staff were in a low-power position upon entering the families' homes. If the situation were made too threatening, the parents would be likely to terminate services and project involvement. Developing a trust relationship which permitted continued service delivery was given higher priority than comprehensive data collection for all program components.

Fewer problems were encountered in collecting data on the home visitor component since each home visitor knew, prior to program involvement, that the process of data collection was an intregal part of the project.

Data kept on the 135 children referred to the project included sex, birthdate, county of residence, referring person and outcome of referral. Data on ages and county of residence is summarized in Table 1.1 in Appendix B. As can be seen from this table 66 children (48%) were between the ages of three and five. Two counties, Fergus and Yellowstone generated 63% of all referrals. This undoubtedly reflects the concentration of population in these two counties as well as the location of Project Sunrise offices in Lewistown (Fergus County) and Billings (Yellowstone County).

The majority of the referrals (75%) came from the professional community including public health nurses, social workers, directors of preschools and special education programs. Referrals also resulted from developmental screening activities. One referral was made by a physician. Approximately 18% of all referrals were made by the parents or guardians. The remaining referrals (6%) were made by family friends, neighbors and relatives.

The majority of children referred (95%) were considered to be mildly handicapped and needed environmental and language stimulation programs or behavior management programs. A number of these children were referred by child protection agencies and public health nurses who felt the children were at-risk due to environmental conditions in the home or because of limited parenting skills of the primary caregivers. Two children who subsequently received out-of-home placements were considered to be severely/profoundly handicapped. Five children were considered to be moderately to severely handicapped.

Of the 135 children originally referred to the program, 67 received direct services during the three year demonstration cycle. Direct service was defined as "two or more meetings with the family at the home or center site." The purpose of these meetins was to provide the parents with information about the handicapping condition, to discuss more appropriate parenting techniques, to investiage potential alternatives for a diagnostic evaluation, and to provide learning materials and activities to use during the time prior to the next visit.

Some children might have benefited from intervention had their parents desired services. Parents of 15 children referred to the project were approached about services; however, they elected not to participate in the program. It is the feeling of the project personnel that most parents who refused services simply were not at the point of acceptance regarding their child's delay or problems and resented agency 'interference" in their family. This attitude is common in Montana where a spirit of pioneer independence is highly valued. Especially in the very rural areas there is a perceived stigma attached to accepting help from agencies. (It is, however, acceptable to help and receive help from one's neighbors.) Some parents may have refused to participate for fear of community censorship.

It is also the feeling of some public health nurses and social workers that families who have a history of child abuse or neglect may tend to move to more rural areas where agencies cannot as readily monitor family activities. At least one family rejected services in an attempt to maintain their isolation and avoid further involvement with the court and child protective services. In general home visitors felt that there was a low success rate where families were required by the courts to accept project services.

The results of intervention with the 20 families on which pre and post data was available are reported in Table 1.2 Appendix B. All twenty families received direct services for a minimum of six months. The children ranged in age from one month to five years at the time of referral. The Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile was administered pre and post intervention as a measure of child performance and growth.

The measure of child progress was calculated by charting anticipated rate of growth based on the child's developmental age upon entering the program and comparing it to actual rate of growth following a minimum of six months intervention. Developmental areas examined included physical, self-help, social, academic and communication. As indicated in Table 1.2, 95% of the children demonstrated gains over the anticipated rate of growth in at least four of the developmental areas charted.

An additional 40 children received direct services for which pre and post data is unavailable. Nineteen families received direct services for a period of six months or longer prior to adoption of the Developmental Profile but for a period of less than six months following adoption of the instrument. Six families moved before post data could be collected and families of seven children were unwilling to assit or participate in the interview necessary to the data collection procedure.

Approximately 15 children were served by Project Sunrise during the summer months and entered preschool special education, Head Start or other preschool programs in the fall. This reflects the liaison role which Project Sunrise played in coordinating services to young handicapped children.

Parent changes noted by the home visitors included increased frequency of praise and ignoring techniques in dealing with their child, selection and purchase of more educationally appropriate play materials, use of

modeling and expansion techniques to stimulate language development and use of task analysis to teach complex tasks in simple steps. Parents themselves have reported more enjoyable relationships with their child after learning to use positive child management techniques.

Parent satisfaction reports were obtained by annually mailing questionnaires to parents who received direct services from the project. The results of the parent satisfaction reports are reported in Table 1.3, Appendix B.

In general, parents reported a high level of satisfaction with services provided by the home visitors. They were satisfied with the materials and activities provided during the home visit. In some cases parents seemed to feel that training should be scheduled both at the center site and at home. Some parents indicated a desire to meet with other parents of handicapped children.

Comments which parents made regarding the program included, "my home visitor has put out and my children learned and loved it," and "Project Sunrise really helped my child."

Parent satisfaction reports were idicative of the success with which the paraprofessional home visitors had been trained to provide services. Positive parent response to the home visitors indicates that training and supervision were sufficient and that using community-based paraprofessional home visitors may be a viable service delivery option in rural areas.

All nine home visitors selected were women, eight of the nine were parents and four of them had at least one adopted child. All but two of the home visitors were between the ages of 20 and 35. Both trainees who were older than forty subsequently resigned.

Four of the home visitors were educators. One had a B.A. and one had an M.S. in elementary education. Two were trained in secondary education

and one in special education. Three were registered nurses. Only two home visitors had not completed a Bachelor level degree. One of these had two years college training as well as experience in working with preschool children. Only three home visitors had previous experience in working with handicapped individuals. Two public health nurses had experience in home visiiting using a medical model.

Recruitment and maintenance of home visitors posed some problems. A total of ten candidates were selected for training. Two, however, dropped out prior to completion of in-service training. Home Visitor #1, representing Big Horn County did not complete the pre-service training session and further recruitment efforts did not produce a replacement for that county. Big Horn County is a large rural sparsely populated county which is largely comprised of the Crow Indian Reservation. These factors may have accounted for the difficulty in recruitment of a home visitor for the service area. Home Visitor #2 was a retired nurse. After completing pre-service training she felt she had some basic philosophical differences which she could not resolve satisfactorily and resigned. A secondary educator was recruited to take her place.

Home Visitors #3 and #4 resigned during the first eight months of project services. Home Visitor #3 had a small caseload and did not feel positively about the home visiting experience, which may have been due to personality factors on her part, to a lack of responsiveness on the part of the assigned families or to a combination of the two. Poor health was an additional factor contributing to her resignation. Home Visitor #4 cited problems related to insufficient financial reimbursement considering the poor roads over which she was required to travel and the resulting damage to her vehicle.

A replacement, Home Visitor #5, was trained to take the place of Home Visitor #3. The families served by Home Visitor #4 were picked up by the local school district resource teacher who was hired part time to serve preschool children. The resource teacher, who had no preschool experience or training, had made joint home visits with the Project Sunrise home visitor to enhance her home visiting skills.

Recruiting, training and maintaining staff is not a simple task in rural areas. Home visitors often feel professionally isolated. Families may be reluctant to accept services creating a feeling of personal rejection on the part of the home visitor. Wages and travel reimbursements are scarcely compensation for the investment of time and effort. It is essential, therefore, that home visitors experience a great deal of personal satisfaction in serving their assigned families and children. Also a strong support system needs to be developed to support the home visitor personally and professionally.

Home visitors were asked to evaluate the model and their involvement with the program. Results of this evaluation are reported in Table 1.4 in Appendix B.

Home visitors responding to the questionnaire indicated high degree of satisfaction with preservice training and ongoing inservice training to assist the home visitor in meeting identified competencies. Home visitors also indicated a belief that association with Project Sunrise has benefited them professionally. When asked to describe your professional growth during the time you were associated with Project Sunrise one home visitor responded with the following comment:

> I believe I gained most proficiency in the areas of breaking tasks down, rapport with parents and in understanding the difficulty of working with a child's handicaps 24 hours a day while helping the rest of the family and yourself live a normal life.

From the period of July 1, 1979 - March 1, 1980 an average of 26 families representing an average of 27 children were directly served by the project per month. Cost per child, utilizing a home visitor, was $832.12 for the nine month period. This figure reflects direct service costs which include $10.00 per home visit, per diem and mileage at .185¢ per mile. The figure does not reflect administrative costs.

Based upon child progress data, parent and home visitor evaluation and service delivery costs per child, the investigators have concluded that the Project Sunrise Model is an effective service delivery system for use in rural, isolated areas similar to Montana.

If the need for special education is minimized during the formal education process and if these children subsequently become more productive members of society as adults, the benefits may far outweigh the initial program investment. The public and policy makers are well advised to seriously weigh the long term benefits to be accrued by making an investment in early intervention for handicapped children.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
1.0 To maintain current staff	1.1 Coordinator reviews applications for Early Childhood Special Education Specialist and recommends top three applicants for interview. Top three applicants are then interviewed by the Project Director and center staff. A vacancy for the position of Early Childhood Special Education Specialist is advertised throughout the state of Montana and at colleges and universities throughout the Western United States offering degrees in Early Childhood Education.	1.1 Early Childhood Special Education Specialist hired on 8/27/79 for position in Lewistown. This position opened again on December 14, 1979 and was filled 1/14/80. The Early Childhood Special Education Specialist in Billings resigned effective April 1, 1980. The position was not filled due to the limited time remaining for third year demonstration activities	As measured by hiring of Early Childhood Special Education Specialist effective 1/14/80.
	1.2 Coordinator reviews applications for graduate Assistantship. The top three applicants are interviewed.	1.2.1 One graduate assistant hired as of 9/24/79.	As measured by graduate assistant performing center aide role 9/24/79 - 6/30/80.
	1.3 Candidates for the position of secretary for the Lewistown office were interviewed by Early Childhood Special Education Specialist in that office.	1.3.1 The position was filled 10/11/79.	As measured by signed contract for services from 10/11/79 to 6/30/80.
	1.4 Coordinator and Special Education Specialists interview home visitor applicants should existing positions become vacant.	1.4.1 The position of Home Visitor for Stillwater County became vacant 9/10/79 and was filled 10/15/79.	As measured by signed contract for service delivery within Stillwater County.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
2.0 To maintain staff development as an ongoing activity.	2.1 Weekly conferences were scheduled between the Project Director and the Project Coordinator.	2.1.1 Minimum 50 hours scheduled for project activity review.	As measured by written documentation.
	2.2 Project Director and Project Coordinator attended Project Director's conference 12/2/79 - 12/7/79, Washington, D. C.	2.1.1 Personal contacts with Project Directors throughout the country culminated in a sharing of resources.	As measured by written or telehone contacts with other HCEEP projects during Demonstration Year III.
	2.3 Monthly staff meetings were scheduled to provide continuity between the two demonstration sites. In addition, inservice activities, to promote professional growth were maintained.	2.3.1 A minimum of 12 days were scheduled for staff conferences. Inservice designed to increase the supervisory skills of the Early Childhood Special Education Specialists was conducted 7/24/79 Inservice designed to increase the specialist's skill in conducting productive meetings was provided 8/21/79.	As measured by participants responding to five questions designed to evaluate workshop effectiveness. 100% of responses were four or better on a five point scale.
	2.4 Technical assistance was provided through Western States Technical Assistance Resource WESTAR).	2.4.1 Arthur J. Moreau, President, Continuing Education Programs of America, Peoria,Il. provided one day on site technical assistance 12/18/79 directed toward continuation funding alternatives.	As measured by participants responding to five questions designed to evaluate technical assistance effectiveness. 100% of responses were four or better on a five point scale.
		2.4.2 One Early Childhood Special Education Specialist attended the topical conference March 12-15 in Nashville, Tenn.	As measured by participation in the development of a rural consortium.
	2.5 Home Visitor staff development maintained through weekly contacts between the supervisor and the home visitor. Home visitors were encouraged to review articles published in professional journals, available at both demonstration sites.	2.5.1 A minimum of 107 conferences were scheduled between the home visitors and the supervisor.	As measured by documentation in daily log.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
	2.5 Continued In addition, home visitors were invited to participate in the Montana Symposium on Early Education and the Exceptional Child, Feb. 29 and Mar. 1, 1980 at Eastern Montana College.	2.5.1 Home visitor staff registered for college credit for the Symposium.	80% of the home visitors attended the Montana Symposium on Early Education and the Exceptional Child. 40% of Sunrise home visitors registered for credit at the Symposium.
	2.6. Staff identified proposal writing skills as high priority through informal assessment.	2.6.1 Scholarship awarded Sunrise for one staff member to participate in Grantsmanship Workshop, 1/80 Coordinator attended Grantsmanship Workshop, 6/80.	As measured by two of three grants submitted (one local, one federal) recommended for funding.
	2.7 The home visitor skills in working with parents are continuously refined and expanded through formal and informal training sessions with project staff, access to professional journals, brochures, video tapes, cassette tapes and weekly contact with participating families.	2.7.1 Home visitors continued working toward completion of identified competencies.	As measured by 80% of the home visitors reaching criteria on 100% of 42 identified competencies. The remaining 20% achieved 62% of the identified 42 competencies as of 4/80.
.0 To maintain regularly scheduled advisory council meetings.	3.1 Advisory Council meetings scheduled 9/11/79, Billings, 1/8/80, Lewistown, and 5/13/80 Billings. Scott Lane, Coordinator, Early Education Programs for the Handicapped for the State of Montana invited to present 9/11/79.	3.1.1 Scott Lane, Montana State Department presented on 9/11/79. Advisory Council convened in Lewistown 1/8/80 and in Billings 5/13/80.	As measured by 60% attendance 9/11/79, 60% attendance 1/8/80 and 10% attendance 5/13/80.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
4.0 To collect and organize child progress data for inclusion in the final report.	4.1 The Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile administered upon entrance into the program and thereafter every six months. The child's functional level was determined by administering appropriate components of the Uniform Performance Assessment Scale (UPAS) and/or the Curriculum Assessment Monitoring System (CAMS). Programs developed on the basis of the UPAS and/or CAMS were reassessed on a quarterly bais to measure child progress.	4.1.1 The Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile pre and post was administered to 17 project children. A total of 90 educational programs were reassessed during the period of 7/1/79 - 6/30/80.	As measured by progress data collected on 100% of program children and pre/post data utilizing the Developmental Profile available for 36% of program children.
5.0 To continue field testing model through 4/80	5.1 Regularly scheduled home visits were continued through 4/80 on a need basis	5.1.1 Direct Services provided 7/79: 27 children in 29 families 8/79: 24 children in 21 families 9/79: 29 children in 27 families 10/79: 32 children in 29 families 11/79: 28 children in 27 families 12/79: 28 children in 25 families 1/80: 26 children in 26 families 2/80: 26 children in 24 families 3/80: 23 children in 23 families 4/80: 22 children in 22 families	As measured by a random sampling of project parents responding to five yes/no questions indicating their satisfaction with services received. 100% of parents (N=10) sampled indicated satisfaction with services received.
6.0 To continue parent training activities.	6.1 Six home visitors made regularly scheduled home visits to project families.	6.1.1 Home visitors provided parent training to an average of 23 families per month during the project year.	As measured by 100% of home visitors rated at least adequate in 12 identified home visit competency areas on Home Visitor Supervisory Report.
	6.2 A parent/child lending library was maintained on site in Billings and Lewistown.	6.2.1 Educational toys designed to to assist in meeting child program objectives and reading materials designed to enhance parenting skills were disseminated to participating families.	As measured by 100% of program families utilizing materials from this lending library.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
7.0 To continue Child Find procedures as an going objective.	7.1 Conduct individual and community screenings.	7.1.1 Individual screening conducted for 28 children. Community screenings representing 42 school districts impacted 856 children.	As measured by 34 referrals to the project resulting from the implementation of Child Find procedures and 69 children referred to appropriate disciplines for a more in-depth evaluation.
8.0 To provide direct services to eligible children.	8.1 Home visitors scheduled weekly training sessions in the homes of participating families.	8.1.1 Child progress was monitored by the home visitor and appropriate modification of education programs implemented for the 47 children receiving direct services.	As measured by 100% of program children receiving direct services.
9.0 To seek continuation funding	9.1 Technical assistance through Western States Technical Assistance Resource (WESTAR) was requested.	9.1.1 Arthur J. Moreau, President Continuing Education Programs of America, Peoria, Illinois, provided on-site technical assistance.	As measured by the identification of alternative funding sources through through both private and public sectors.
	9.2 Funding options at the federal level were identified.	9.2.1 Project Sunrise Outreach Grant submitted 2/80	As measured by official funding award notification received 7/80.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
10.0 To promote an awareness of the need for early intervention through demonstration and dissemination	10.1 Project staff submitted presentation to the Second Annual Regional Conference for Severely/Profoundly Handicapped screening committee	10.1.1 Project staff presented one and one half hour sectional 8/28/79 at the Second Annual Regional Conference for Severely/Profoundly Handicapped, University of Idaho, Pocatello.	As measured by written requests for additional information following the conference.
	10.2 An invitation was extended to Scott Lane, Coordinator, Early Education Programs for the Handicapped for the State of Montana, to present to the Project Sunrise Advisory Council.	10.2.1 A total of six advisory council members and eleven Eastern Montana College faculty and students attended the presentation.	As measured by ten requests for additional information, both verbal and written.
	10.3 Project staff presented to Billings Preschool Association.	10.3.1 Twenty-five early childhood educators attended the Sunrise presentation. Representatives of the Billings Preschool Association visited the Project Sunrise demonstration site for additional inservice in meeting the needs of young handicapped children.	As measured by 50% of the Billings Preschool Association indicating an interest in registering for an Early Childhood Special Education class through Eastern Montana College.
	10.4 Project staff served as chairperson for the selection of a screening instrument for the Billings Public Schools.	10.4.1 The Comprehensive Identification Process (CIP) was recommended for use by the Billings Public Schools.	As measured by adoption of the CIP by the Billings Public Schools.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
	10.5 Project staff provided in-service training in the use of the Comprehensive Identification Process (CIP) for the St. Ignatius Head Start staff on 10/1/79	10.5.1 A total of fourteen Head Start staff for Ronan, St. Ignatius, Polson, Pablo and Arlee participated in the inservice training.	As measured by participants responding to seven questions designed to evaluate workshop effectiveness. 75% of the participants rated on the workshop six or seven on a seven point scale.
	10.6 Project staff provided in-service training in the use of the Comprehensive Identification Process (CIP) for the Hardin Public Schools on 11/6/79.	10.6.1 A total of fourteen individuals participated in the day long inservice training.	As measured by participants responding to five questions designed to evaluate workshop effectiveness. 100% of participants rated the workshop six or seven on a seven point scale.
	10.7 One hour information sharing presentations were made by Project staff.	10.7.2 Project staff made the following guest presentations: 1. Teacher Corps interns Eastern Montana College 7/7/79. 2. Roundup Public Schools Special Education staff 10/79 3. The Central Montana Learning Resource Cooperative, 11/79 4. The Eagle Program, Montana Center for Handicapped Children, 12/79. 5. Kwanis, Billings, 2/80 6. Special Education Aide interns, Eastern Montana College, 2/80 7. Denton Public Schools 2/80	As measured by impacting 89 people through guest presentations.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
	10.8 Project staff conducted SG 453: Preschool Education For the Handicapped through the Institute for Habilitative Services of Eastern Montana College, Summer quarter, 1979, Winter quarter, 1980 and Summer Quarter 1980.	10.8.1 Eight students registered for undergraduate credit, nine students registered for graduate credit.	As measured by students responding to seven questions designed to evaluate effectiveness of the class. 100% of the students rated SG 453 six or seven on a seven point scale.
	10.9 Project staff submitted presentation to the State Council for Exceptional Children conference screening committee.	10.9.1 Project staff was invited to present at the Montana State CEC convention on 3/28-29/80 in Great Falls, Mt.	As measured by particpants responding to seven questions designed to evaluate effectiveness of the presentation. 85% of the participants rated the presentation 5 or better on a seven point scale.
	10.10 Project Sunrise, in Cooperation with the School of Extended Studies and Community Services sponsored The Montana Symposium on Early Education and the Exceptional Child on February 29 and March 1, 1980.	10.10.1 A total of 132 individuals registered for the one and one half day Symposium which was offered for one graduate credit hour or one undergraduate credit hour. Keynote speakers included Dr. Bud Fredericks, Teaching Resource, Monmouth, Ore., Dr. Diane Bricker, University of Oregon, at Eugene and Arthur J. Moreau, President, Continuing Education Programs of America of Peoria, Il. Additional guest speakers were Georgia Ruth Rice, State Supt. of Public Instruction and Shirley Miller, State Director of Special Education. A State Department panel addressed the Roles and Reponsibilities of State Agencies to Young Handicapped Children and Their Families.	As measured by 41 registered for graduate credit, 31 registered for undergraduate credit and 60 individuals registered for non-credit.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
		10.10.1 Continued Panel members included Bailey Molineaux, Ph.D., Mental Health and Residential Services Division; Dept. of Institutions. Peggy Fields, Administrator, Developmental Disabilities Div. Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Services. Charlie McCarthy, Bureau Chief, Child and Youth Development Bureau, Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Services. Shirley Miller, State Director of Special Education, Office of Public Instruction. Sidney Pratt, M.D. Bureau Chief, Maternal and Child Health Bureau, Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Services.	
11.0 To identify key areas for outreach activities	11.1 Conduct needs assessment throughout Montana and Northern Wyoming.	11.1.1 Respondents indicating needs in the following areas by number of staff which could benefit from the following outreach activities: 1. 189: training to serve as a member of a team responsible for conducting annual preschool screening. 2. 230: training teachers/staff to serve preschool handicapped children. 3. 261: training support/personnel staff to more effectively work with parents of handicapped children. 4. 222: actvities designed to promote an awareness amongst school board members, administrators and others of the need for early education/intervention with preschool handicapped children and their families.	As measured by 94% of administrators contacted indicating release time could be made available to their staff to attend workshops/inservices offered through outreach.

OBJECTIVE	PROCEDURE	OUTCOME	EVALUATION
		11.1.1 Continued 5. 171: activities designed to promote an awareness among the medical and services community for early education/intervention with preschool handicapped children and their families. 6. 166: a statewide symposium 7. 166: the development of a statewide communication and training network. 8. 133: a statewide newspaper on early education activities 9. 209: workshop designed to address identified needs of staff members serving preschool handicapped children. 10. 177: technical assistance in the development and evaluation of center-based or home-based programs for the exceptional child.	

APPENDIX A

PROJECT SUNRISE

Workshop Evaluation Form

St. Ignatius, Mt.

October 1, 1979

Question	Number of Responses	Rating (%) 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
1. The organization of the workshop was:	14	43%	43%	7%				
2. The objectives of the workshop were:	14	21%	57%	7%			7%	
3. The work of the consultant(s) was:	14	57%	36%					
4. The ideas and activities presented were:	14	50%	36%	7%				
5. The scope (coverage) was:	14	21%	50%	14%				
6. My attendance at this workshop should prove:	14	36%	50%					
7. Overall, I consider this workshop:	14	29%	57%					

8. Do you feel a need for additional information about the topic presented?

Yes 14% No 86%

Stronger features:
Role playing, screening, well presented and informative

Weaker features:
Not enough time

General Comments:
The information presented will b e very useful for working with and evaluating children and their needs.

PROJECT SUNRISE

Workshop Evaluation Form

Hardin, Montana

November 27, 1979

Question	Number of Responses	Rating (%) 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
1. The organization of the workshop was:	7	42%	57%					
2. The objectives of the workshop were:	7	71%	29%					
3. The work of the consultant(s) was:	7	71%	29%					
4. The ideas and activities presented were:	7	42%	57%					
5. The scope (coverage) was:	7	71%	57%					
6. My attendance at this workshop should prove:	7	71%	14%	14%				
7. Overall, I consider this workshop:	7	71%	14%	14%				

8. Do you feel a need for additional information about the topic presented?

Yes 29% No 71%

Stronger features:

Group presentation and organization "show and tell" instructions - clear

Weaker features:

More time - role playing

General Comments:

Thanks

PROJECT SUNRISE

Workshop Evaluation Form

Hamilton, Mt.

March 21, 1980

	Number of Responses	Rating (%) 5	4	3	2	1
Overall, I consider this workshop:	15	33%	53%	13%		
Stronger features of the workshop:	Well organized - interesting - thorough - role playing - Good background information on CIP					
Weaker features of the workshop:	More time needed for role playing - Instruction aimed too low (reading from manual)					

Great Falls

State CEC

March 27, 28, 29, 1980

PROJECT SUNRISE

Workshop Evaluation Form

Question	Number of Responses	Number of Responses (5 or better)	Rating (%) 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
1. The organization of the workshop was:	34	88%	21%	35%	32%	06%	06%	--	--
2. The objectives of the workshop were:	29	79%	28%	34%	17%	14%	03%	03%	
3. The work of the consultant(s) was:	32	84%	34%	31%	19%	09%	06%	--	--
4. The ideas and activities presented were:	32	94%	38%	25%	31%	06%	--	--	--
5. The scope (coverage) was:	25	84%	20%	32%	32%	16%	--	--	--
6. My attendance at this workshop should prove:	26	73%	04%	42%	27%	15%	08%	04%	--
7. Overall, I consider this workshop:	34	89%	21%	44%	24%	03%	06%	03%	--

8. Do you feel a need for additional information about the topic presented?

Yes 13 No 8

Stronger features: Ranking exercise, positive attitude, audience participation, emphasis on early intervention, bibliography for presentation.

Weaker features: Data forms, time too short.

General Comments: Information re: parenting, appreciate preschool emphasis, implementation ideas, need list of start-up requirements for pre-school, slide presentation of work, want more information re Project Sunrise.

RETURN BY FEBRUARY 25, 1980 WITH COVER LETTER

PROJECT SUNRISE

Needs Assessment

Outreach Activities for Schools and Agencies

February, 1980

Name of School/Agency 31 Respondents

Address Montana and Northern Wyoming

Contact Person and Title _____

A. How many staff members would you estimate to be available to participate in the following training sessions, if offered?

1. 189 Training to serve as a member of a team responsible for conducting annual preschool screening

2. 230 Training teachers/staff to serve preschool handicapped children

3. 261 Training support personnel/staff to more effectively work with parents of handicapped children

B. How many community leaders would you estimate to be willing to participate in the following awareness activities, if offered?

1. 222 Activities designed to promote an awareness amongst school board members, administrators and others of the need for early education/intervention with preschool handicapped children and their families

2. 171 Activities designed to promote an awareness amongst the medical and services community for early education/intervention with preschool handicapped children and their families

C. How many staff members would you estimate to be available to participate in the following activities regarding early childhood education and the exceptional child?

1. 166 A statewide symposium

2. 166 The development of a statewide communication and training network

3. 133 A statewide newsletter on early education activities

D. How many staff members would you estimate to be interested in the following activities designed to strengthen on-going or proposed preschool special education programs, if offered?

1. 209 Workshops designed to address identified needs of staff members serving preschool handicapped children

2. 177 Technical assistance in the development and evaluation of center-based or home-based programs for the exceptional child

E. Would you utilize the following materials, if available?

	Yes	No	
1.	26	6	Training modules for effectively working with parents of preschool handicapped children
2.	31	1	Training modules for implementing a preschool screening program
3.			Training modules for service delivery through:
a.	25	7	a home-based program
b.	27	5	a center-based program

F. How many preschool handicapped children (ages 0-5) are currently receiving services through your school agency? 475

G. Do you anticipate serving preschool handicapped children during the 1980-81 school year?

1. Yes 22 If yes, how many? 481

2. No 9

H. Would your administration grant release time for the teachers/staff to attend in-service training activities?

1. Yes 29 If yes, approximately how many days? Most respondents indicated 1 - 3 days

2. No 2

EVALUATION SUMMARY

MONTANA SYMPOSIUM ON EARLY EDUCATION and THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

February 29 - March 1, 1980

Please indicate your position: _____

This evaluation is designed to provide information concerning the quality and impact of this sumposium and will aid in the development of future symposiums. Your assistance is appreciated.

A. OBJECTIVE EFFECTIVENESS

Please rate the symposium objectives according to the following scale:

5 - - - -Objective Accomplished (A)
4
3 - - - -Objective Partially Accomplished (PA)
2
1 - - - -Objective Not Accomplished (NA)

	A		PA		NA
1. To create an awareness of the need for early intervention	5 46%	4 29%	3 22%	2 1%	1 1%
2. To create an awareness of funding alternatives for service delivery	5 21%	4 27%	3 33%	2 4%	1 3%
3. To provide information regarding state agencies responsiblities to young handicapped children	5 15%	4 26%	3 23%	2 13%	1 6%
4. To provide options for delivery of services to children and parents	5 20%	4 33%	3 25%	2 16%	1 1%

B. PRESENTATIONS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Friday 2/29	Quality					Usefulness				
	Very Good		Good		Poor	Very Useful		Of Some Use		Not Useful
Presenter: Dr. Bud Fredericks: Ingredients for Quality Education for the Young Handicapped Child	5 61%	4 34%	3 5%	2 -	1 -	5 53%	4 32%	3 15%	2 1%	1 -
Presenter: Georgia R.Rice: The Young Handicapped Child and the Decade Ahead	5 36%	4 41%	3 21%	2 4%	1 [illegible]	5 16%	4 16%	3 39%	2 4%	1 26%

B. PRESENTATIONS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, Continued

Friday 2/29	Quality					Usefulness				
	Very Good		Good		Poor	Very Useful		Of Some Use		Not Useful
Presenter: State Department Panel: Roles and Responsibilities of State Agencies in Serving Young Handicapped Children and Their Families	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Total Attendance — 65	6%	23%	40%	25%	15%	6%	42%	24%	35%	16%
Presenter: Arthur J. Moreau: Alternative Funding Strategies: An Emphasis on Private Resources and Responsibilities	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Total Attendance — 47	21%	38%	43%	9%	—	11%	30%	34%	21%	3%
Saturday 3/1										
Presenter: Dr. Diane Bricker: Implications of Early Language Development in Training Strategies for Young Children	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Total Attendance — 51	70%	16%	10%	3%	1%	60%	16%	8%	4%	4%

C. MINI-SESSION PRESENTATIONS

Friday 2/29	No. Attending	Quality					Usefulness				
		Very Good		Good		Poor	Very Useful		Of Some Use		Not Useful
		5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
1. Managing the Aggressive/Passive Child at Home and School Rena Wheeler, Early Childhood Specialist, Project Sunrise, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana	40	15 38%	12 30%	5 20%	3 13%	0 —	11 27%	15 38%	5 13%	5 20%	1 03%
2. Mainstreaming: Setting the Stage Dr. Billie Thomas, Assistant Professor of Education, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana	17	3 18%	6 35%	6 35%	1 06%	1 06%	3 18%	4 23%	6 35%	3 18%	1 06%
3. Accessing State Monies: Where to Get It and How to Keep it Scott Lane, Coordinator, Early Education Programs for the Handicapped, Office of Public instruction, Helena, Montana	15	1 07%	5 33%	5 33%	3 20%	1 07%	2 13%	4 27%	3 20%	3 20%	3 20%
4. Identification and Intervention of Child Abuse and Neglect Cases John Fisher, Yellowstone County Welfare Department, Pat Sauer, M.D.; Damon Gannett, Attorney, Billings	13	6 46%	3 23%	4 31%	0 —	0 —	5 38%	3 23%	4 31%	1 08%	0 —

SATURDAY MINI-SESSION EVALUATION

	No. Attending	Quality					Usefulness				
		Very Good		Good		Poor	Very Useful		Of Some Use		Not Useful
		5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
AGENDA											
Details for the Successful Classroom Teacher Dr. Bud Fredericks, Research Professor, Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon	24	14 58%	8 33%	1 04%	1 04%	0 –	15 63%	4 17%	3 13%	2 08%	0 –
Oh, Dear, What To Do:- Teaching Techniques for The Autistic Child. Judy Syndegaard, Teacher, Billings, Montana.	16	11 67%	3 19%	2 13%	0 –	0 –	12 75%	2 13%	2 13%	0 –	0 –
A Coordinated Approach to Evaluation and Treatment of Handicapped Children in Rural Areas Pete Degel, Director, Developmental Assessment Services, Inc., Glendive, Montana	10	1 10%	2 20%	5 50%	2 20%	0 –	1 10%	1 10%	5 50%	1 10%	2 20%
Curricular Activities for Young Children: Sense or Nonsense Dr. Vesta Anderson, Associate Professor, Montana State University, Child Development Center, Bozeman, Montana	19	3 18%	1 06%	8 47%	5 29%	0 –	3 18%	3 18%	2 12%	8 47%	1 6%
Professional Concerns for the Young Handicapped Child: Questions and Answers Dr. Diane Bricker, Professor of Special Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon	28	9 32%	10 36%	9 32%	0 –	0 –	7 25%	11 39%	7 25%	2 07%	1 04%
Evaluating Effectiveness of Early Education Programs: Convincing Policy/Decision Makers That What We Do Works Dr. Tom Oaster, Associate Professor of Education, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana Rena Wheeler, Early Childhood Specialist, Project Sunrise, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana	17	1 06%	4 24%	8 47%	4 24%	0 –	2 12%	3 18%	8 47%	4 24%	0 –
Montana Child and Family Services Network for The Hard-to-Serve Ron Langworthy, Director, Special Training For Exceptional People, Billings, Montana Bill Smith, Director of Region II, Child and Family Services, Great Falls, Montana	5	2 40%	2 40%	1 20%	0 –	0 –	2 40%	2 40%	1 20%	0 –	0 –
Parent-Teacher Interaction Dr. Elia Nickoloff, Acting Director, Montana Center for Handicapped Children, Billings, Montana	25	13 52%	9 36%	3 12%	0 –	0 –	14 56%	9 36%	2 08%	0 –	0 –
Alternative Funding Strategies: An Emphasis on Non-Tax Resources Arthur J. Moreau, President, Continuing Education Programs of America, Inc., Peoria, Illinois	4	4 29%	1 07%	6 43%	3 21%	0 –	2 14%	1 07%	5 36%	6 43%	0 –
Billings Early Education Program: Assessment of Infants and Preschoolers Carolyn McKennan, Principal Wilma Nickoloff, Early Childhood Intervention Specialist, McKinley Elementary School, Billings, Montana											
Cooperative Skill Building: A Case Study Annalee Allen, Speech Pathologist; Joy Hettinger, Occupational Therapist; Lorin Wright, Physical Therapist; Montana Center for Handicapped Children, Billings, Montana	20	13 65%	3 15%	4 20%	0 –	0 –	7 35%	5 25%	3 15%	5 25%	0 –
Competencies for Early Childhood Educators Serving Native American Populations Susan Bailey, Regional Handicapped Specialist, Tri-State Tribes, Inc., Billings, Montana Donna Caruso-Hirst, CDA, Blackfeet Head Start, Browning, Montana.	12	3 25%	3 25%	3 25%	3 25%	0 –	3 25%	2 17%	1 08%	2 17%	3 25%

Project Sunrise
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Permit No. 483
Billings, Mont.

MONTANA SYMPOSIUM

ON

EARLY EDUCATION

AND

THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD

A symposium designed for administrators, educators social workers, nurses, home trainers, therapists, counselors, psychologists, Head Start personnel, parents, day care providers and others building skills in infants and young children (birth through eight years).

February 29 & March 1, 1980
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana

Project Sunrise
Institute for Habilitative Services
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Mt. 59101
406/657-2250

SKILL DEVELOPMENT FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

MONTANA SYMPOSIUM ON EARLY EDU

Early education and intervention are important because:

The need for costly special education can be minimized or even eliminated by making available appropriate programs for young children. Even though P.L. 94-142 has highlighted the need for early education, many professionals lack the training necessary for intervention with young children.

This Symposium will provide participants with current information on planning and development of programs to serve young children with a wide range of needs and handicapping conditions.

Specialists from many fields will discuss:

- the abused and neglected child
- enhancing communication, social skills and motor skills in the young child
- funding alternatives for service delivery
- parent involvement in educational programs
- roles and responsibilities of state agencies in serving handicapped children and their families

Sponsors:

PROJECT SUNRISE is a **BEH** funded First Chance Project of the Institute for Habilitative Services, Eastern Montana College. It provides home-based services to handicapped children and their families living in 12 counties of south central Montana.

THE SCHOOL OF EXTENDED STUDIES AND COMMUNITY SERVICE
Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana

About Our Presenters

Diane Bricker Professor of Special Education at the University of Oregon, is well known in the area of language development with young handicapped children.

Bud Fredericks of teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon, is widely recognized for his conributions in working with severely handicapped young children.

Shirley Miller Director of Special Education for the State of Montana, has been actively involved in promoting legislation to aid in the education of young handicapped children.

Arthur J. Moreau President of Continuing Education Programs of America, Inc., in Peoria, Illinois, is nationally recognized for his ability to secure funding through private resources.

Georgia Ruth Rice Superintendent of Public Insturction for the State of Montana, has provided effective educational leadership at the state level and is an active advocate for handicapped children.

MONTANA SYMPOSIUM ON EARLY EDUCATION AND THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD

School of Extended Studies and Community Service
Box 80
Eastern Montana College
Billings, MT 59101

All those registering should make their own hotel arrangements!

- ☐ $25 Symposium Registration enclosed
- ☐ $20 additional credit fee enclosed if registering for credit.
- ☐ non-credit registration
- ☐ one under graduate credit
- ☐ one graduate credit

Make checks payable to:
Eastern Montana College

Name _____

Agency _____

Address _____

For additional information contact Project Sunrise at 406/657-2250

project sunrise

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

The locations for all of the invited addresses and mini-sessions will be in the Liberal Arts/Library Complex building on the campus of Eastern Montana College.

Registration fee for the Symposium is $25 and will cover attendance at all sessions, coffee, donuts and materials packet.

One credit at either the undergraduate or graduate level is available for an additional $20 credit fee through the Institute for Habilitative Services. Applicants must meet admission requirements of Eastern Montana College.

A Resource Room with texts, materials and displays will be available throughout the Symposium in the Liberal Arts building, room 527.

The Symposium site is relatively barrier free, however, if special accommodations are necessary, please advise Project Sunrise or the School of Extended Studies and Community Service of whatever assistance you may require.

Accommodations are the responsibility of the participants and should be made early.

CATION AND THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD

PROGRAM SCHEDULE: FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1980

TIME	LOCATION	AGENDA
9:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.	Liberal Arts (LA) Building: Lobby	Registration
1:00 p.m. - 1:15 p.m.	Library: Rm 152	**Opening remarks:** Dr. Larry W. Jones, Academic Vice President, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana **Welcome:** Dr. John Van de Wetering, President, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana
1:15 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	Library: Rm 152	**Keynote Address: Ingredients for Quality Education for the Young Handicapped Child** Dr. Bud Fredericks, Research Professor, Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon
2:15 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.		Break
2:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Liberal Arts (LA)	**Mini Session** (Concurrent Sessions, see Mini-Session Schedule below).
3:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.		Break
4:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.	Library: Rm 152	**The Young Handicapped Child and the Decade Ahead** Georgia Ruth Rice, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Montana, Helena, Montana
4:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.	Library: Rm 152	**State Department Panel: Roles and Responsibilities of State Agencies in Serving Young Handicapped Children and Their Families**
6:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.		Break
7:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.	Library: Rm 152	**Keynote Address: Alternative Funding Strategies: An Emphasis on Private Resources and Responsibilities** Arthur J. Moreau, President, Continuing Education Programs of America, Inc., Peoria, Illinois
8:30 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.	To be announced	No-host social

FRIDAY MINI-SESSION SCHEDULE

2:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.

Concurrent Sessions		
	LA 636	1. **Managing the Aggressive/Passive Child at Home and School** Rena Wheeler, Early Childhood Specialist, Project Sunrise, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana
	LA 637	2. **Mainstreaming: Setting the Stage** Dr. Billie Thomas, Assistant Professor of Education, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana
	LA 633	3. **Accessing State Monies: Where to Get It and How to Keep it** Scott Lane, Coordinator, Early Education Programs for the Handicapped, Office of Public instruction, Helena, Montana
	LA 634	4. **Identification and Intervention of Child Abuse and Neglect Cases** John Fisher, Yellowstone County Welfare Department, Billings, Montana

PROGRAM SCHEDULE: SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1980

TIME	LOCATION	AGENDA
8:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Liberal Arts (LA) Building: Lobby	Registration
9:00 a.m. - 9:15 a.m.	Library: Rm 152	**Welcome:** Dr. Ronald Sexton, Director, Institute for Habilitative Services, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana
9:15 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	Library: Rm 152	**Keynote Address: Implications of Early Language Development in Training Strategies for Young Children** Dr. Diane Bricker, Professor of Special Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
10:15 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.		Break
10:30 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.	Liberal Arts (LA) Building	**Mini Session** (Concurrent Sessions, see Mini-Session Schedule on following page).
11:45 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.		Break
1:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	Liberal Arts (LA) Building	**Mini Session** (Concurrent Sessions, see Mini-Session Schedule on following page).
2:15 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.		Break
2:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Liberal Arts (LA) Building	**Mini Session** (Concurrent Sessions, see Mini-Session Schedule on following page).

SATURDAY MINI-SESSION SCHEDULE

TIME	LOCATION	AGENDA
10:30 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.	LA 634	1. **Details for the Successful Classroom Teacher** Dr. Bud Fredericks, Research Professor, Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon
Concurrent Sessions	LA 633	2. **Preschool Education: The State of Affairs** Scott Lane, Coordinator, Early Education Programs for the Handicapped, Office of Public Instruction, Helena, Montana
	LA 636	3. **A Coordinated Approach to Evaluation and Treatment of Handicapped Children in Rural Areas** Pete Degel, Director, Developmental Assessment Services, Inc., Glendive, Montana
	LA 637	4. **Curricular Activities for Young Children: Sense or Nonsense** Dr. Vesta Anderson, Associate Professor, Montana State University, Child Development Center, Bozeman, Montana
1:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	LA 634	1. **Professional Concerns for the Young Handicapped Child: Questions and Answers** Dr. Diane Bricker, Professor of Special Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
Concurrent Sessions	LA 636	2. **Evaluating Effectiveness of Early Education Programs: Convincing Policy/Decision Makers That What We Do Works** Dr. Tom Oaster, Associate Professor of Education, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana Rena Wheeler, Early Childhood Specialist, Project Sunrise, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana
	LA 637	3. **Montana Child and Family Services Network for The Hard-to-Serve** Ron Langworthy, Director, Special Training For Exceptional People, Billings, Montana Bill Smith, Director of Region II, Child and Family Services, Great Falls, Montana
	LA 633	4. **Parent-Teacher Interaction** Dr. Elia Nickoloff, Acting Director, Montana Center for Handicapped Children, Billings, Montana
2:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	LA 634	1. **Alternative Funding Strategies: An Emphasis on Non-Tax Resources** Arthur J. Moreau, President, Continuing Education Programs of America, Inc., Peoria, Illinois
Concurrent Sessions	LA 637	2. **Billings Early Education Program: Assessment of Infants and Preschoolers** Carolyn McKennan, Principal Wilma Nickoloff, Early Childhood Intervention Specialist, McKinley Elementary School, Billings, Montana
	LA 633	3. **Cooperative Skill Building: A Case Study** Annalee Allen, Speech Pathologist; Joy Hettinger, Occupational Therapist; Lorin Wright, Physical Therapist; Montana Center for Handicapped Children, Billings, Montana
	LA 636	4. **Competencies for Early Childhood Educators Serving Native American Populations** Susan Bailey, Regional Handicapped Specialist, Tri-State Tribes, Inc., Billings, Montana JoAnn Elliott, Director, Northern Cheyenne Head Start Program, Lame Deer, Montana

Printed by
COLOR WORLD OF MONTANA, INC.
201 E. Mendenhall, Bozeman, MT 59715

APPENDIX B

PROJECT SUNRISE

Referrals by Age and County

1-30-78 to 1-30-80

County	0-1 yrs.	1-2 yrs.	2-3 yrs.	3-4 yrs.	4-5 yrs.	5-6 yrs.	6-7 yrs.	Older than 7 yrs
Big Horn	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	
Carbon				1		1		
Fergus	2	2	4	7	13	6	1	
Golden Valley					1			
Judith Basin		1	1	1	1	1		
Musselshell		1			3	2		
Petroleum			2	1		1		
Stillwater		1	3		2	1		
Sweet Grass					1	1		
Treasure						1		
Wheatland					1	2		
Yellowstone	8	5	8	16	6	8		
Not in service region or age span					1			2
TOTALS	11	10	19	29	37	25	2	2

Table 1.1

PROJECT SUNRISE

Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101

CHILD PROGRESS DATA

		Case Number	2.26	2.32	2.28	2.27	3.4	3.17	1.33	1.1
PRE-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE	Functional Level		Age in Months							
		Chronological Age	32	27	71	3	68	63	44	51
		Physical Age	36	22	34	0	32	66	42	50
		Self Help Age	34	30	52	0	50	70	56	70
		Social Age	28	28	34	0	48	82	28	58
		Academic Age	26	24	34	0	40	74	32	44
		Communication Age	32	24	34	0	32	52	30	46
	Anticipated Rate of Development		Anticipated Growth Rate							
		Physical Age	1.12	.81	.47	.00	.47	1.05	.95	.98
		Self Help Age	1.06	1.11	.73	.00	.74	1.11	1.27	1.37
		Social Age	.87	1.03	.47	.00	.70	1.30	.63	1.13
		Academic Age	.81	.88	.47	.00	.59	1.17	.72	.86
		Communication Age	1.00	.88	.47	.00	.47	.83	.68	.90
POST-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE	Functional Level		Age in Months							
		Chronological Age	40	34	80	14	75	68	50	58
		Physical Age	42	36	50	12	56	74	50	59
		Self Help Age	50	36	52	10	62	84	80	83
		Social Age	52	34	50	12	62	78	37	68
		Academic Age	40	34	60	12	56	78	56	57
		Communication Age	40	32	50	10	42	58	36	52
	Developmental Rate		Actual Growth Rate							
		Physical Age	1.05	1.05	.62	.85	.75	1.08	1.00	1.01
		Self Help Age	1.25	1.05	.65	.71	.83	1.24	1.60	1.43
		Social Age	1.30	1.00	.62	.85	.83	1.15	.74	1.17
		Academic Age	1.00	1.00	.75	.85	.75	1.15	1.12	.98
		Communication Age	1.00	.94	.62	.71	.56	.85	.72	.89
RESULTS OF INTERVENTION			Gain/Loss Over Anticipated Rate of Growth							
		Physical Age	-.07	+.24	+.15	+.85	+.28	+.03	+.05	+.03
		Self Help Age	+.19	-.06	-.08	+.71	+.09	+.13	-.17	+.06
		Social Age	+.43	+.03	+.15	+.85	+.13	+.15	+.11	+.04
		Academic Age	+.19	+.12	+.28	+.85	+.16	-.02	+.40	+.12
		Communication Age	.00	+.06	+.15	+.71	+.09	+.02	+.06	-.01

Table 1.2

PROJECT SUNRISE

Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101

CHILD PROGRESS DATA

	Case Number	2.49	1.1	1.36	1.27	1.43	1.45	1.33
PRE-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE — Functional Level		Age in Months						
	Chronological Age	1	51	47	26	33	29	44
	Physical Age	0	50	36	14	28	34	42
	Self Help Age	0	70	82	16	26	14	56
	Social Age	0	58	64	24	30	20	28
	Academic Age	0	44	44	18	22	26	32
	Communication Age	0	46	38	20	20	22	30
PRE-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE — Anticipated Rate of Development		Anticipated Growth Rate						
	Physical Age	0	.98	.76	.54	.85	1.17	.95
	Self Help Age	0	1.37	1.74	.67	.79	.48	1.27
	Social Age	0	1.14	1.36	.92	.91	.69	.64
	Academic Age	0	.86	.94	.69	.67	.90	.73
	Communication Age	0	.90	.81	.77	.61	.76	.68
POST-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE — Functional Level		Age in Months						
	Chronological Age	5	63	59	33	38	34	55
	Physical Age	2	62	59	26	38	42	54
	Self Help Age	4	70	90	24	36	44	50
	Social Age	4	70	82	24	32	40	37
	Academic Age	4	70	70	28	34	34	50
	Communication Age	4	66	82	26	28	32	48
POST-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE — Developmental Rate		Actual Growth Rate						
	Physical Age	.4	.98	.10	.78	1.0	1.24	.98
	Self Help Age	.8	1.11	1.53	.73	.95	1.29	.91
	Social Age	.8	1.11	1.39	.73	.84	1.18	.67
	Academic Age	.8	1.11	1.19	.85	.89	1.0	.91
	Communication Age	.8	1.04	1.39	.79	.74	.94	.87
RESULTS OF INTERVENTION		Gain/Loss Over Anticipated Rate of Growth						
	Physical Age	+.4	0	+.24	+.24	+.15	+.07	+.03
	Self Help Age	+.8	+.26	-.21	+.06	+.16	+.81	-.36
	Social Age	+.8	-.03	+.03	-.19	-.07	+.49	+.03
	Academic Age	+.8	+.25	+.94	+.16	+.22	+.01	+.18
	Communication Age	+.8	+.14	+.58	+.02	+.13	+.18	+.19

Table 1.2

PROJECT SUNRISE

Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101

CHILD PROGRESS DATA

		Case Number	1.48	1.49	3.10	3.11	3.13			
PRE-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE	Functional Level		Age in Months							
		Chronological Age	59	26	41	20	19			
		Physical Age	50	22	46	16	16			
		Self Help Age	50	26	48	20	20			
		Social Age	50	28	38	24	22			
		Academic Age	52	24	32	19	15			
		Communication Age	36	20	30	18	16			
	Anticipated Rate of Development		Anticipated Growth Rate							
		Physical Age	.85	.85	1.12	.80	.84			
		Self Help Age	.85	1.0	1.17	1.0	1.05			
		Social Age	.85	1.08	.92	1.20	1.15			
		Academic Age	.88	.92	.78	.95	.78			
		Communication Age	.61	.77	.73	.90	.84			
POST-TEST DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE	Functional Level		Age in Months							
		Chronological Age	63	30	49	28	27			
		Physical Age	66	26	52	28	26			
		Self Help Age	66	36	62	30	28			
		Social Age	74	30	54	36	30			
		Academic Age	58	32	46	30	24			
		Communication Age	62	26	42	28	24			
	Developmental Rate		Actual Growth Rate							
		Physical Age	1.04	.87	1.06	1.0	.96			
		Self Help Age	1.04	1.20	1.26	1.07	1.03			
		Social Age	1.17	1.0	1.10	1.28	1.11			
		Academic Age	.92	1.06	.93	1.07	.88			
		Communication Age	.98	.87	.85	1.0	.88			
RESULTS OF INTERVENTION			Gain/Loss Over Anticipated Rate of Growth							
		Physical Age	+.19	+.02	-.06	+.20	+.12			
		Self Help Age	+.19	+.20	+.09	+.07	-.02			
		Social Age	+.32	-.08	+.18	+.08	-.04			
		Academic Age	+.04	+.14	+.15	+.12	+.11			
		Communication Age	+.37	+.10	+.12	+.10	.04			

Table 1.2

PROJECT SUNRISE

Parent Satisfaction Evaluation Form

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The home visitor provided appropriate materials to aid me in working with my child.	70%	30%			
2. The home visitor demonstrated the activities to be used with my child.	50%	50%			
3. The home visitor clearly answered any questions I had pertaining to the use of the materials.	33%	67%			
4. My child enjoyed working with the home visitor.	80%	20%			
5. Home visits should be scheduled once a week.	20%	50%	30%		
6. The home visitor provided me with information about my child's particular handicap.	50%	50%			
7. I would feel comfortable about contacting Project Sunrise between home visits.	50%	50%			
8. Training I received at the Sunrise Center aided me in working with my child (do not ansser if you did not receive training at Sunrise Center).	60%	40%			
9. Training I received at home aided me in working with my child.	75%	25%			
10. I feel training shoul. be scheduled only in my home.	15%	15%	15%	55%	
11. I feel training should be scheduled at Sunrise Center and in my home.	28%	28%	42%		
12. I feel training should be scheduled only at Sunrise Center.	14.5%		14.5%	71%	
13. I would like to meet with other parents of handicapped children.	12.5%	12.5%	75%		
14. I am satisfied with services received through Project Sunrise.	88%	12%			

Table 1.3

PROJECT SUNRISE

Home Visitor Evaluation

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I believe that the majority of my families looked forward to my home visits.	5 20%	4 80%	3	2	1
Comments:					
2. I believe that parents' parenting skills increased as a result of my home visits.	5 20%	4 60%	3 20%	2	1
Comments:					
3. I believe that parents carried through on suggestions and activities.	5 40%	4 60%	3	2	1
Comments:					
4. I believe that children made progress on developmental tasks during the time I made home visits.	5 40%	4 60%	3	2	1
Comments:					
5. I believe that the Project Sunrise training was sufficient to prepare me to serve as a home visitor.	5 40%	4 60%	3	2	1
Comments:					
6. I believe that there was sufficient contact with my supervisor to help me serve my assigned families.	5 20%	4 80%	3	2	1
Comments:					
7. My association with Project Sunrise was of benefit to me professionally.	5 80%	4 20%	3	2	1
Comments:					

Table 1.4

8. If I could have changed anything about the program it would have been

Comments: In order to keep trainers on staff for an extended period, something definitely needs to be figured out on the mileage and wear and tear on a vehicle. In many instances you need a 4-wheel drive unit and the mileage just doesn't come near covering the expense. Also tire wear can be a terrific factor on rural roads!!

9. Please describe your professional growth during the period of time you were associated with Project Sunrise.

Comments: Made me more aware of the stages of developmental growth. Encouraged me to do more study concerning exceptional children. Rapport with parents, understanding the difficul of working with a child's handicaps 24 hours a day. Benefited from the associations with my supervisors and other agency people. Better understanding of principles of behavioral intervention. Better understanding and recognition of importance of developmental landmarks and and how to assess those. I really used the knowledge both while working with Project Sunrise - and in assessing clients - in my work as a public health nurse.

Education(highest grade/degree completed)

Two: Bachelor of Science in Nursing
Two: Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education
One: Master of Science in Elementary Education

Experience:

In teaching

In preschool

In working with the handicapped

In parenting

Table 1.4